IMC Meeting Minutes: 10-27-2006

Minutes transcribed by Georgia Frueh, OIT staff.

I. Call to Order: 1:35 pm – Chairman Picanso

IMC Commissioner Attendance: Lutz, May, McGimpsey, Monkman, Delmonico, Mulford, Picanso, Rippy (via Telecon) Dennis, Marroney, Wells, and Coleman.

Introduction of Commissioners and Audience Members

A. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Picanso opened the meeting by introducing Susan Lynn?? – who will be supporting the Attorney General's office with privacy initiatives throughout the state.

B. Meeting Minutes

Chairman Picanso called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the September 2006 IMC meeting. There was no discussion and they were approved unanimously.

Motion	Motion: Commissioner McGimpsey; 2nd: Secretary Dennis

The IMC approved the 9-15-06 IMC Minutes.
Approved unanimously.

C. Adopted Motions/Action Items

Chairman Picanso asked the Commission if there were any adopted motions or action items that needed to brought forward. At this point Commissioner Lutz made a motion for this Commission to endorse both John Picanso as the State CIO and Mark Weatherford as the State CISO and that this Commission recommends to the incoming Governor that "we retain both of them in their current positions."

Motion	Motion: Commissioner Lutz; 2nd: Secretary Dennis

There was no discussion and the IMC then approved the retention (with the recommendation to the incoming Governor), of John Picanso as State CIO and Mark Weatherford as State CISO.

Chairman Picanso thanked the Commission. Commissioner Delmonico then asked Commissioner Lutz if the Commission should send a recommendation letter to the Governor Elect – Commissioner Lutz stated that they could send a letter now to both candidates or wait until after the election. It was agreed to wait until after the elections. He then volunteered to draft the letter and send it to everyone for approval. Commissioner Delmonico stated that she would also like a copy of the letter sent to the new Chief of Staff and at that point also request a meeting.

Action Item	(Commissioner Lutz)

Recommendation letter to be drafted by Commissioner Lutz to the Governor Elect and copied to the new Chief of Staff regarding the retention of both John Picanso as State CIO and Mark Weatherford as State CISO.

Chairman Picanso called forward Elain Radford, OIT staff, to provide the Commission with a review and discussion of the September 15, 2006 Motions and Action Items list. Ms. Radford facilitated the review of each motion and action item providing comments on those that are still in-progress.

She emphasized the approval of the Red Status letter and that the executive directors and CIO's to be included in that project certification process that will be submitted to the Legislature in February.

Elain continued stating that all of the action items are still in progress, so there is no full update but the Commission will continue to be updated.

Chairman Picanso interjected to point out that regarding **Action Item# 1 (**regarding the development of a policy on website domain naming and the use of the right side of Colorado.gov, etc.) - there is a draft out to five stakeholders to review the draft – version 1.0 - and he has already received two draft email responses that agree. He further stated that those comments will be sent out and that hopefully the policy will be sent out within the next few days.

He then went on to state that regarding **Action Item #4** (re: Commissioner Malinowski will send the DPA-DoIT transition plan to the OIT/IMC for review, etc.) he communicated with Commissioner Malinowski late yesterday and that Commissioner Malinowski is working on it and they will be getting together and have a brief discussion on that as well.

He continued saying that **Action Item # 5** (re: conference call between the CEO of Project Management Institute (PMI) and John Picanso regarding project certification) is now closed - he worked with Commissioner Vanderschouw and the CEO of PMI – they had a two hour phone conference last week or the week before.

No discussion followed.

II. Old Business

Chairman Picanso called forward Elain Radford, OIT staff, to present the IMC Executive Monthly Project Readouts and Dashboard Report.

A. Project Readouts

1. IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard Report

Elain stated that the **IMC Executive Project Dashboard SUMMARY** in the Commissioner's Briefing Notebooks, showed that almost all the projects that were in RED Status have moved into YELLOW status, and some that were discussed in the Rick Management Subcommittee earlier this morning were moved into GREEN Status. She further stated that there were three projects reporting today, the first being:

> **DPA-DoIT MNT** annual Report – Paul Nelson in place of Rick Malinowski presented. Paul stated that their project is in GREEN status and gave an overview of the report making the point that they've determined through the state's multi-use network project that

broadband telecommunications within the state is necessary for continued economic development and enhances the quality of life for business and citizens throughout the state. He emphasized that the main goal of the project was to connect urban and rural communities across the state, bridging the Digital Divide. He further made the point that through MNT the state became an anchor tenant allowing the development to build out broadband services throughout Colorado. Today there are services throughout Colorado, i.e., DSL that offer economic broadband solutions for not only government but private sectors on the network.

Senator May interjected with his concerns around partnering with Qwest and their "dark fiber" vs. T1 and hooking up with T1 as opposed to MNT. Paul assured the Senator that they are working directly with Qwest to eliminate some of this and they have also purchased services through the competitive process which gives the ability to address those in the future. The contract with Qwest runs through 2010, but he made the point that Qwest is not the only provider.

Commissioner Wells interjected here making the point that the original contract was for five years – but the cost was spread out over those five years. There were budget shortfalls with the arrival of the year 2001, due mainly to the recession and to 9/11. "*The reason we stuck with Qwest at that juncture is because we went back to them and took the remaining balance of two years that we owed them on the contract and spread it out over seven years but did not pay any additional money with the exception of the Use Fees. The Use Fees are a little higher but we stopped paying all of the Qwest internet fees for the entire time period and took what we would have paid them in two years and spread it out over seven.*" He continued saying that based on the budget conditions at the time, it really was a good deal for the state. He emphasized that Qwest has done a good job marketing their T-1's on the outside, as well as a good job marketing job on the MNT - in the counties that Qwest is doing it they are basically self-sufficient lines. Our bigger problem is in the 22 counties that don't have enough end users yet to fully support the system yet and we are augmenting and supporting that. He made the point that all of that will be addressed in the 2010 contract. He also stated that just before June 30th. of this year he signed a contract with Century Tel and with C-Com, but he coordinated them all to end with the same 2010. At that juncture the re-bidding should be re-designed so that they are just paying Use Fees and none of the subsidization fees. He emphasized that it was good for the state to move it to 2010 in terms of the savings, with the agreement that we would continue to use the system for the next five years which "*we would have done anyway*."

Senator May then asked about going forward with e-rate funds in terms of schools connected with the MNT – marketing and helping them to apply for e-rate. Paul assured him that we were indeed going forward and we continue to grow that business every year.

There was a bit more discussion around VOIP with Commissioner Wells making the point that it will be delayed because it is under protest around switching from one vendor to another. He stated that the RFP is already out, and that he would have expected to have the contract signed prior to the end of October but it will now be delayed.

Paul finished his overview of the annual report, concluding by pointing out an error in the report – there was an oversight – there is a reference to the number of county seats with DSL – the report says 97, it should be 92.

There was no further discussion.

Chairman Picanso acknowledged how well done the report (that was handed out to the commission) was, saying it was an excellent document and thanked Paul and his team for a job well done. He encouraged them to continue on and thanked them for the update.

Chairman Picanso recognized Representative Fran Coleman who with Senator May, authored and sponsored the Cyber Security Bill. He continued saying that it is probably one of the most forward pieces of legislation across the country right now. He then mentioned the fact that at the National CIO Conference he recently attended, that there was a lot of discussion around Colorado's cyber security posture, etc.

Chairman Picanso concluded these remarks by saying, "*that it is because of legislators like Representative Fran Coleman who support the good work of IT and this Commission across the state of Colorado,that the state was able to get a CISO, and aggressive legislation put in place.*" At this point he presented her with a certificate/plaque of appreciation with "Our deepest appreciation and heartfelt thanks for all the hard work you've given to the Commission over the last few years."

Senator May interject here saying that "*Fran doesn't know this yet, but Mark Weatherford and I have re-worked 1157 into a more generic form, and it will be presented at ALEC (National Legislators' Conference) December 6th as a national model bill.*" he then thanked Representative Coleman for all her hard work.

Chairman Picanso apologized at this point for the "side-bar" and called on Elain Radford to continue.

Elain introduced the next project:

Department of Human Services – DVR – RISE

After mentioning that she did not see the CIO present, she introduced the Nancy Smith - Division Director and project sponsor, Dan McKee - Project Manager and the IV&V Manager Len Vest to give the presentation.

Chairman Picanso interjected saying that "for the record" he spoke to the CIO late last night and stated that "he did send his regrets that he could not attend, but he felt the team was more then capable to come up and give us a status report."

Nancy Smith introduced herself and stated that "we are pleased to report that we appeared before the Sub Committee this morning with a supplemental report on the results of the recovery plan that has been completed by our contractor, HCL Technologies just this past Wednesday." She continued stating that "*this was a plan designed to get them back on track in terms of the project. We re-baselined the schedule with HCL, they've created a staffing plan that we have approved that will support completing the schedule. They've provided all the deliverables within the recovery plan and they continue to be working now under the schedule as it's been re-baselined. Our commitment at DVR and CDHS is still very strong to this project, not only my commitment but our steering and leadership committee. We have*

multiple workers that at any point in time are providing the input to the various modules of this particular tool that we are building." She introduced Dan McVee and Len Vest.

Chairman Picanso asked for questions or discussion – there was none. He pointed out that they had a very thorough and rigorous review on the project status earlier today.

At this point Commissioner Delmonico asked that they give a summary report for the record.

Len Vest went over some key important points in the risk management sub committee earlier that helped to turn this project around:

1. HCL has taken responsibility for increasing the staffing size and quality of staff, which has shown in the deliverables over the last two months in the recovery plan.

Len asked Dan McVee to continue with more key points in terms of the recovery plan and several success factors. He stated that they were asked what the number one factor was going into the recover plan that we wanted to have to insure that we could re-position this project for success. He continued saying that what he had stated this morning was that "*we needed a consistent software development life cycle that clearly defined rolls and responsibilities. That was completed and integrated within the project schedule along with the staffing plan that Len mentioned.*"

Chairman Picanso asked for discussion or comment – none ensued so he thanked them for that summary and detail and excused them.

Elain then introduced the project of CDLE – genesis PRA with the department CIO, Aaron Wishon and the IV&V Project Manager, Dan Wenger.

Aaron Wishon went over some key points in terms of their project recovery stating that "*we've spent the last 30 days taking a really hard look at what our project was attempting to do as well as the timeline upon which we needed to get the work done.*" He went on to say that they have worked very hard in conjunction with the "fine folks at OIT" to re-baseline the project, as well as some comments from the state auditor's office. He was pleased to announce that they have moved out of RED status into YELLOW status. That Yellow Status is due to one outstanding procurement that remains which has to do with the correspondence piece within the PRA assessment. He went on to say that they are in contract negotiations with a vendor on that and that they believe that they are very close pending review by the AG's office they hope to hit that target by the end of the month.

He then went over the handouts and milestones they previously went over in the morning's subcommittee meetings. He concluded by saying that the project is on target and they are working within the bounds as they outlined last month. He asked for questions or comments – there was none. He then turned it over to Dan Wenger to give an IV&V update.

Dan Wenger stated that they are looking at this PRA project as "being a fresh start." He continued stating that things appear to be on track through the upcoming milestones. After that briefing to the PRA Steering committee, they will be putting together the formal recommendation that will go forward to the state. He concluded by saying that "*the project has been well organized with lot's of open communication and things are proceeding well.*"

Chairman Picanso then asked for questions/comments. He went on to acknowledge and thanked the team for the executive leadership support, "not only from the executive director's office, but from the CIO's office, from the IV&V office, from the project team's office. It was because of this good direction, leadership and support that we're now able to get further assistance from you and partner more effectively. He emphasized the resounding "Thank You for allowing us to do that. He thanked the team again stating how much it is appreciated that they have collaborated and been so forth-coming. He encouraged them to "keep that part of it up."

Dan Wenger at that point thanked the Chairman and offered additional copies of the project. Chairman Picanso then asked for questions – no discussion followed and he thanked them for coming and excused them.

Elain Radford pointed out a several items on the Summary sheet of the Dashboard:

1. The **original** Genesis Project still in RED Status and will remain on the Dashboard in RED throughout the project recovery efforts.

2. The Genesis PRA has moved into YELLOW Status.

3. The RISE Project is reflected in YELLOW Status on Dashboard, but as of today the Risk Management Sub-committee did allow that project to move into GREEN Status.

4. The CDOT ERP project remains in YELLOW Status.

5. CSTARS Project – which will report to the Commission next month remains in YELLOW Status – they have deployed at the state, but have not deployed at the counties, but we should get a schedule of those deployment efforts soon.

Senator May interjected here with the question regarding whether or not someone is looking at ERP for possible other state applications other than just CDOT.

Chairman Picanso answered, this stating that he and Rick Malinowski have talked along with some people in OSPB about an enterprise solution for ERP and Commissioner Mulford's sub-committee has "staged the topic up" at least twice. He continued, saying that part of the transition plan discussion will have that project in there at some point to further enterprise more ERP throughout the state of Colorado. That means we'd have to examine coffers with DPA, HR systems, etc., so it is going to be and extraneous project just to get the discussion started.

Senator May then brought up the YELLOW Status and wanted it clarified that it is not the technology of ERP that is in question, but rather the project status at this time.

A little more discussion followed around this with the final point being made by Commissioner Mulford that ERP will be a more lengthy process.

Senator May asked if we are using XML product in various places around the state, in the conversion process, moving data etc..

Commissioner Mulford stated that it has not been discussed in the enterprise architecture, but we can certainly take an action to see how far we've extended XML – we are seeing used in various places throughout the state.

More discussion followed around this with input from the audience in terms of what agencies are currently using XML.

Commissioner McGimpsey asked about number 8 on the dashboard: Judicial – ICON and why they have not yet submitted a status report.

Elain Radford stated that this is a new project added to the dashboard this month and that they have submitted a status report yesterday, so it was too late to include in today's meeting. They have been asked to come and present at the next IMC meeting next month.

Elain continued, stating that on the HAVA SCORE II (item #6) – even though it's reflected in YELLOW Status, they are ready to move into GREEN status – the contract has been signed this week.

There was a bit more discussion around XML with the point being made that it is widely used throughout the industry as the standard and it can certainly be explored further in enterprise architecture with a better report forthcoming.

Representative Coleman referring back to number eight on the dashboard, pointed out that there was an audit report mentioning CICJIS – ICON made the suggestion here that Elain Radford check in with the auditor's office to see if that lends some answers. Elain agreed to research that for the Commission.

There was some discussion around CICGIS and the proposal of a new building to replace the Judicial building "across the street" and whether or not CIGIS is "robust enough" to handle the expansion. The point was made that they are nowhere near ready to move on this as it is just in the beginning "talking/planning stage. The comment was made that it would be a hundred million dollar project and that there are no approvals as yet.

Chairman Picanso suggested that perhaps when Mr. Roper comes next month a discussion could begin around the whole portfolio and that Mr. Roper could help clear up a few of these questions and concerns.

Action Item   **(Chairman Picanso)**

Chairman Picanso stated that he would call Bob Roper regarding this.

Elain pointed out that the Commission is now overseeing almost 230 million dollars in IT projects in the state and these are the major IT projects in the state, not the hundreds of IT projects that continue to be happening in the agencies. Chairman Picanso stated that he would like to highlight once more, that through the work of the agencies and their teams, "that we're on a very good path right now."

Senator May expressed his concern to Elain Radford over the Income Tax System – that it was funded 10 million dollars to start it and how important it is to keep "a close eye" on that. Elain

agreed and stated that OIT is serving on some of their work committees and staying on top of that project. She went on to say that they are in the RFP solicitation process right now and their vendor proposals came in last week – they will be evaluating those and submitting an "Intent-for-Award" in approximately 6 weeks.

Chairman Picanso interjected here to make the point that for this slate of 15 projects, minus the Genesis project at the very top of the dashboard list, we have an OIT representative on these projects either in the form of a steering committee, a project team, an executive team, an IV&V team, etc. He continued, emphasizing that for the most part we have OIT across almost all of these projects and are partnering with these agencies.

Commissioner Delmonico pointed out the amount of vendor participation in the Genesis project, citing the concern in the vendor community about the tax projects and how many competitive bids you're getting – she suggested that it "*might be worthwhile to do something to make sure the vendor community is made aware of this meeting and invite them here so that they can begin to be involved. We should make sure we have a good vendor pool with a lot of competitive bids*."

Elain stated that she does have a distribution list to a number of vendors, but they are vendors who have specifically let her know that they would like to be notified each month of the IMC meetings. She offered to expand on that list if the Commission wished.

Chairman Picanso thought this would be a good idea and suggested that the Division of Purchasing works with a many vendors in the community at large – and they do a very good job of sharing. He went on to say that typically he get's called right after the vendor speaks to someone in Purchasing.

There was a bit more discussion with the point being made by Commissioner Delmonico that more vendors should be invited somehow to the IMC meetings.

Senator May interjected here to say that he misstated his concern about the Income Tax System, he really meant to say the Tax system in general. He then suggested it would be nice to see a timeline of those pieces that will be coming in. Elain point out that in the IMC packet under the "Budget Requests) she has included a section (item #4) on CITA and schedule for the five phases through the year 2010, including the different initiatives that will be worked on and developed throughout each year.

No further discussion followed.

Chairman Picanso made mention of a point that was not in the agenda concerning CIMA and the invitation to Cheyenne Mountain Resort to come to the November 30th event and hold a joint IMC/OIT/CIO forum meeting as we did last year. He also mentioned it in the sub-committees earlier today.

He then opened it up for discussion.

There was discussion around holding the next IMC meeting there and different scheduling conflicts from various Commissioners.

It was finally established that the next IMC meeting and sub-committees would remain here as usual on November 17th with the joint roundtable meeting would be at the Cheyenne Mountain Resort on Wed. 11/29 from 1:00 to 5:00 pm, with a dinner following – Commissioners only.

III. NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Picanso then called both Commissioner Monkman and Elain Radford to review the annual IT Budget Requests received from the agencies. He stated that historically the Commission reviews this, a motion is made, seconded and a vote taken and moved over as a "voted item."

Commissioner Monkman stated that this list of 15 projects – fourteen from the Executive Branch and one from Department Law totaling $30 million dollars in total funds and $2.6 million dollars general fund, represents a process of collaboration between OIT, which looks at the technological feasibility of decision items and OSPB, which looks at the business case for decision items. It also represents many of the things that as a Commission and OIT and it's charter are trying to do. He cited Enterprise Solution - Item #1 DHS – CBMS Disaster Recovery, IT Asset Plans: Item #7 and #8, Legacy system replacement - #9 and even Project Management in an indirect way, mentioning #6 – The automated Childcare System. He concluded, saying that this list of projects is what OSPB is sending forward as part of its requirement, to the JBC.

Chairman Picanso thanked Commissioner Monkman and emphasized here that the staff of OIT collaboratively worked with OSPB on the approval of these items. At this point he asked Elain Radford to take the list and read from the top, the Department name, the project name and the overall total request as well as the project recommendation from OIT to OSPB so that the Commission is very clear and the audience can hear if their project is listed or not.

Elain then presented each Item number.

A. FY 2007-08 IT BUDGET REQUESTS:

Priority #1:

Motion	Motion: Senator May; 2nd: Commissioner Delmonico

#1 – DHS: CBMS Disaster Recovery: total requested: **$562, 418.00** - OIT recommends moving forward with this project.

Priority #1 was voted on and approved.

Priority #2:

Motion	Motion: Representative Coleman; 2nd: Commissioner Mulford

#2 – GOV: Project - Information Security Project: total requested: **$2,418,617.00 –** OIT recommends moving forward on this project.

At this point there was some discussion about encryption software being included. Representative Coleman interjected here to explain to Senator May that this is a response to a breach to our systems and we're asking the respective agencies to submit a plan. They have up to three years - in those plans we can ask for encryption plans. She went on to make the point that "this can't be looked at as a systems project but rather as more of the policy of how we're going to proceed when there is a security breach of any given system and how the CISO responds as well as the people that are identified for him to go into that emergency mode."

Chairman Picanso stated that this does not include an encryption product. At this point, Representative Coleman pointed out that there was a typo on Item #2 and that it should read HB 06-1157 – not 1156.

(Commissioner Delmonico recused herself from this vote.)

Priority #2 was voted on and approved.

Priority #3:

Motion	Motion: Senator May; 2nd: Commissioner Delmonico

#3 DPS: Project – CCIC Message Switch Replacement: total requested: **$7,616,725.)** OIT Recommends moving forward with this. Chairman Picanso stated here that there are conditions with this approval (found in the packet).

Priority #3 was voted on and approved.

Priority #4:

Motion	Motion: Senator May; 2nd: Representative Coleman

#4: DOR: Project - Revenue Tax System (Phase II) total requested: **$9,515,475.00**

OIT recommends moving forward with this project.

Priority #4 was voted on and approved.

Priority #5:

Motion	Motion: Representative Coleman 2nd: Senator May

#5 DOR: Project – Fire Suppression System total request: **$98, 527.00** (for the Pierce street facility)

OIT recommends moving forward with this project.

Representative Coleman stated that at this point she wasn't sure that the requested amount will be cover it "but we'll see what happens along the way.

Priority# 5 was voted on and approved.

Priorities #6a and 6b:

Motion	Motion: Representative Coleman 2nd: Senator May

#6a DHS: Project – Automated Child Care System (redevelopment of the tracking system) total request: **$8,528,637.00** (OIT recommended this with conditions– which Chairman Picanso read from the handout in the packet.)

#6b DHS: Automated Child Care System (operating funds in support of the capital development project) total request: **$73, 924.00**

Senator May voiced his concern that this was not presented in Risk Management and not much is known about this.

Commissioner Monkman interjected here to say that this request had been before the Joint Budget Committee last year. At that time the Capital Development Committee approved this as a project, as did OSPB and OIT last year. Out of concerns about project management and knowing that Senate Bill 063 was pending, a letter was sent to CDC to delay the project for one year so that we would have that project management in place – so this has been very carefully scrutinized by OSPB, OIT and CDC.

Commissioner Delmonico made the point that it hasn't come before the Risk Management Committee, because it isn't a project yet.

Chairman Picanso stated that this project was included in the IT planning documents last year and that it is on record that OIT is aware of the project; OIT followed this project and checked it out last year.

There was a bit more discussion on the use of this swipe-card technology being used by other states which are enjoying budget savings by capturing fraud and preventing abuses of child care federal funds.

Priorities #6a and 6b were voted on and approved with Senator May opposed.

Priority #7:

Motion	Motion: Commissioner Wells 2nd: Representative Coleman

#7 DOLE - Project: IT Asset Replacement total request: **$243,096.00**
OIT recommends moving forward with this request.

There was some discussion on the funding amount and it was established that the full request was indeed, $243,096.00. A recommendation was made that there should be more money for this project because it is generally felt that it is under funded**.**

More discussion followed with Commissioner Wells adding to the original motion to make the recommendation in writing to OSPB requesting an additional $240, 000.00 in funding for a total of $500,000.00 to be approved for this project.

Priority# 7 was voted on and approved with a recommendation for an additional $240,000.00 in funding for this project to total $500,000.00.

Priority #8:

Motion	Motion: Senator May 2nd: Representative Coleman

DNR – Project: OGCC IT Increase total request: **$91,338.00**
OIT recommends moving forward with this request.

Senator May asked Elain Radford if this project was in accordance with their asset management plans. Elain stated that she believed it did.

Priority #8 was voted on an approved.

Priority #9:

Motion	Motion: Senator May 2nd: Secretary Dennis

DORA – Project: ITS – Imaging System Replacement total request: **$102,210.00**
OIT recommends moving forward with this request.

No discussion followed.

Priority #9 was voted on and approved.

Priority #10:

Motion	Motion: Senator May 2nd: Representative Coleman

DORA – Project: ITS-Wireless Broadband for Remote Access total request: **$36,886.00**
OIT recommends moving forward with this request.

Commissioner Mulford commented that "we have quarterly updates on computing standards and the we should make sure that this group is taking a look at this as part of our configuration so we could get better buying power as a state."

Priority #10 was voted on and approved.

Priority #11:

Motion	Motion: Senator May 2nd: Representative Coleman

DNR – Project: OGCC IT Staff (IT Prof III) total request: **$78,235.00**
OIT recommends moving forward with this request.

Senator May asked if this was an "add-on" or if this is new. Elain stated that it is new. Chairman Picanso interjected here to emphasize that this project really needs support on this.

Priority #11 was voted on and approved.

Priority #12:

Motion	Motion: Representative Coleman 2nd: Secretary Dennis

DOR – Project: Tax Audit Software total request: **$93,522.00**
OIT recommends moving forward with this request.

Priority #12 was voted on and approved.

Priority #13:

Motion	Motion: Secretary Dennis 2nd: Representative Coleman

DNR – Project: Parks – Entrance Automation (feasibility study) total request**: $500,000.00**

Discussion followed around the magnitude of this undertaking so it is necessary to do a feasibility study. Chairman Picanso stated that even though the amount seems high, this follows along with the discussion they had in Subcommittee about "Best Practices."

Commissioner Delmonico voiced her concern at the high amount and asked for clarification on what the feasibility study would entail.

Elain Radford stated that it is part of the division's strategic plan that a feasibility assessment be conducted before they move forward – they do anticipate that this will be a very major project and they want to collect data and facts before they move ahead.

Chairman Picanso made pointed out that they will be trying to make new equipment interface with older equipment already in place, and technology is very behind at some of the more remote state parks and they want to bring in new equipment to test interoperability, infrastructure, co-existence, etc. He continued, stating that not all sites that need this technology, have electricity, phone or internet connections.

Commissioner Delmonico stated that she would agree with it if they provided a detailed breakdown of the equipment cost. Elain Radford interjected here that the feasibility study would not be for purchasing equipment – she then cited the four key points on page 2.
Number 4 – **Assessment Overview**.

Chairman Picanso pointed out that on page 4 it states "equipment - $476,190.00" and he further stated that there seems to be a gap. He then asked to approve it with the condition that they get back to the Commission with clarification in data.

There was a bit more discussion around the equipment issue and the need for more clarification on the feasibility study and compliance, since it is a capital development project.

OIT recommends – with conditions - moving forward with this request.

Priority #12 was voted on and approved – with the condition that OIT go back and get more clarification in terms of detailed data.

LAW:	
Motion	Motion: Secretary Dennis 2nd: Commissioner Monkman

Law – Project: IT Staff Request (IT Prof III) total request: **$85,345.00**
OIT recommends moving forward with this project.

No discussion followed.

LAW was voted on and approved

_____

B. Major It Projects Certification Process:

Presented by Jim Jones, OIT Staff/Project Manager:

Jim started by saying that he will be introducing OIT's fulfillment of Senate Bill 063 and this will be referred to going forward as the IT Certification Process, since there will probably be another SB 63 later on. He then provided a detailed overview of the handout.

Key Points:
- Establish Policies & Procedures for Acceptable Project Plans (i.e., Best Practices)
- Create PM & PMA Job Classifications in Collaboration with DPA
- Establish Project Management Personnel Certification Process
- Implement Project Management Personnel Training Plan for State Employees
- Create Project Certification Process
- Report to Legislative Committees on Compliance with Best Practices for "Major" Projects
- Establish Team of Project Managers (this is internal to OIT)

Jim continued saying that this process is designed to be very straight forward and very easily implemented. The check list is supported by deliverables to be supported by each major project, backed up by templates that will be put on the OIT Website and those templates will be backed up by "Best of Breed" documentation from the various state agencies that can be downloaded from the OIT website by the agencies. This is under the assumption that any documentation in IT worth writing has already been written – all they have to do is find it and clone it. Jim stated here that "what we wanted to do was build a very executable process." The result of certification will then support the legislative reporting as well as support the elements of legislation for us to notify the controller surrounding either the release or holding of funds.

Chairman Picanso interjected here directed to Commissioner Delmonico stating that certainly OIT hasn't arrived at the point of how this process will work with the Risk Management over sight of other ongoing projects. That discussion is forthcoming, as well as the PDQ finalization. He then directed his comments to the audience, stating that the results for Senate Bill 063 is the creation of three documents – the overreaching policy, tentatively called IT Project Management Policy, a guidelines document – IT Project Management Personnel Training Professional Certification Guideline, and lastly an IT Major Projects Certification and Procedure. We had discussion about this at the Subcommittee meetings – we will review this at the CIO Workshop/Forum on November 9th (we think) in conjunction with the Cyber Security activities that Mark Weatherford will do. Chairman Picanso continued, stating that Rick Malinowski the Chair of the CIO Forum is having a special meeting on Cyber. There will be two meetings that day, Cyber and an hour to discuss this content. The CIO's will receive these documents today or tomorrow. He then stated that the CIO's will have two weeks to review these packets and get comments back to Jim Jones at Jim.Jones@state.co.us they will then be reviewed by OIT.

There was some discussion around this process and reporting to the Legislative Committees with Chairman Picanso stating that "bottom line, we have to deliver by February 1st."

Jim Jones continued with his overview pointing out the timeline on the last page of the handout. He stated that OIT is introducing this today to both the Commissioners and the agencies' CIOs and on or about November 9th OIT would like to have a workshop with IMC/CIO in order to get feedback from everyone and then OIT will come back to you on Nov. 17th for a final vote. That will allow OIT time between Nov. 17th and the end of the year to certify all the major projects and provide OIT the month of January to produce the report.

No discussion followed. Chairman Picanso cautioned everyone that OIT still has an aggressive schedule with much left to do, and to expect the influx of many documents around this process.

Chairman Picanso then called forward Doug Sample to present:

C. Immigration Verification Portal:

Doug introduced himself and stated that his assignment when he first came on board with OIT was to prepare a response to House Bill 1015, which is the Work Eligibility Verification Portal. He then read the two abridged sentences of HB 1015 directed to OIT.

"OIT shall, no later than December 31st. 2006, submit a report to JBC that sets forth an implementation plan for the establishment of a Work Eligibility Verification Portal, that on or after January 1, 2008 will enable a person to access the data base to verify whether a tax-payer identification number is valid.

The report shall include an analysis of the anticipated cost of establishing and operating the Portal and description and analysis of data bases and programs available for use in verifying Tax-payer identification numbers, including at a minimum, the Tax-payer identification number matching program administered by the IRS and at least two data bases/programs administered by non governmental entities."

Doug continued stating that OIT met with several groups – OSPB, Policy office and the office of Legal Counsel, reviewing the entire bill and working out a couple of questions/issues that OIT had and the bottom line is that we did come up with clarification in terms of what needed to be done. He went on to state that they identified two major assumptions:

1. That whatever solution we produce must be a low cost effort to the state.
2. The liability to the state must be limited in terms of the handling and processing of confidential and proprietary information.

Doug continued with his presentation giving an overview of criteria in order to implement the solution.

Finally he stated that given the criteria, OIT's recommendation is that the best solution that would be in our best interests, is to establish a link in our (OIT) website connecting with the IRS system because of all the systems out there, they are the only ones who have a complete list of all the EIMs and Social Security numbers.

There was some discussion around the security issue of Social Security numbers brought up by Senator May.

Chairman Picanso concluded here it was considered a technology issue in terms of why it ended up in OIT. He continued stating that bottom line, the report was due December 1st, it is finished and is being reviewed and we hope to send it on in a couple of weeks. We also have a cover letter drafted to the JBC to go along with the report and are prepared to do whatever they wish in terms of follow up.

More discussion followed with Representative Colememan's mention of the Motor Vehicle department not recognizing name changes etc. She continued, stating that she would "like to hear that as you go toward implementing SB 1015 that the Motor Vehicle Department is aligning with what you are implementing, versus what they're doing now.

Chairman Picanso asked that a note be made to check this out and to follow up with Brett. He then asked if there was anything further and excused Doug when there was no more discussion.

Chairman Picanso then moved it along to the IMC Subcommittee Readouts section of the Agenda. He stated that since everyone with the exception of one person attended the readouts, that there was no need to go over them. He then asked for a motion to adjourn.

Secretary of State Dennis interjected here to say that the voting equipment was working well and there should be very few problems and it was "good to go."

Chairman again asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion	Motion: Representative Coleman 2nd: Secretary of State Dennis

Meeting was adjourned at 5:40 pm.

The next IMC Meeting will be held on November 17, 2006 from 1:30 pm - 4:00 pm at the Legislative Services Building, 200 E. 14th Avenue, Hearing Room A – 1st Floor Denver, CO 80203